

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-30 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-30 stand rejected.

The rejection of Claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Claims 13-16 have each been amended to depend from Claim 11.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the Section 112 rejection of Claims 13-16 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,191 to Baker et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Baker”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,853,867 to Klindt et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Klindt”) is respectfully traversed.

Baker describes a control system that allows a user to access an input/output device over a communication network using a web browser. The system includes an input/output device that is interconnected directly to a web server. Notably, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Baker does not describe or suggest an automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, wherein the ACM CPU is further configured to embed ACM data into a file located on the web server and database module, and relies on Klindt as allegedly describing these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

More specifically, Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner’s assertion on page 4 of the Office Action that “Klindt teaches the automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to the web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request.” In contrast to the Examiner’s assertion, Klindt does not describe or suggest embedding ACM data into a file located on a web server and database, rather, Klindt

describes accessing a file located on a web server and partly transferring processing from a web server to a user. More specifically, col. 6, lines 9-14 of Klindt describe “to implement reading information from the controller and displaying it in HTML pages, much of this information handling is done by the JAVA applets running on the browser of the host.” That is, Klindt describes a web page processing transfer from a server to a user by the use of JAVA applets. Thus, Klindt merely describes reading information locally by a transferring of processing by a controller from a server to a user, in contrast to an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and wherein the ACM CPU is further configured to embed ACM data into a file located on the web server and database module, as recited in the present Claims.

Claim 1 recites a web-enabled ACM system comprising, “a computer configured to send a request for a file; a network module located outside of said computer configured to receive the request for the file from said computer via a network; a database located within a web server and database module configured to store the file; a web server located within said web server and database module configured to receive the file from said network module; and an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to said web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to said network module in response to the request, said ACM CPU coupled directly to said web server and database module.”

No combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests an ACM system as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests an ACM system including an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and wherein the ACM CPU is further configured to embed ACM data into a file located on the web server and database module. Rather, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Baker does not describe or suggest an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module and embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request and relies on Klindt as allegedly describing these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that “Klindt teaches the automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to the web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request.” In contrast to the

Examiner's allegation, Klindt does not describe or suggest embedding ACM data into a file located on a web server and database, rather, Klindt describes accessing a file located on a web server and partly transferring processing from a web server to a user. More specifically, col. 6, lines 9-14 of Klindt describe "to implement reading information from the controller and displaying it in HTML pages, much of this information handling is done by the JAVA applets running on the browser of the host." That is, Klindt describes a web page processing transfer from a server to a user by the use of JAVA applets. Thus, Klindt merely describes reading information locally by a transferring of processing by a controller from a server to a user, in contrast to an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and wherein the ACM CPU is further configured to embed ACM data into a file located on the web server and database module, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claims 2-10 and 19 depend from Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-10 and 19 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 2-10 and 19 likewise are patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claim 11 recites a method for managing and controlling an ACM system, said method comprising, "sending a request for a file from a computer through a network to at least one network module located outside of the computer; sending the request from the at least one network module to a web server located within a web server and database module; storing the file in a database of the web server and database module; sending ACM data from an ACM CPU to the web server and database module to embed the ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring the ACM data to the at least one network module in response to the request, wherein the ACM CPU is coupled directly to the web server and database module; retrieving the file from the database via the web server; and transmitting the file from the web server to the computer via the at least one network module and the network."

No combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests a method for controlling automation as recited in Claim 11. More specifically, no combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests an automation method that includes sending ACM data from an ACM CPU to a web server and database module to embed ACM data in a file to facilitate transferring the ACM data to a network module in response to a request. Rather, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Baker does not describe or

suggest an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request and relies on Klindt as allegedly describing these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that “Klindt teaches the automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to the web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request.” In contrast to the Examiner’s allegation, Klindt does not describe or suggest embedding ACM data into a file located on a web server and database, rather, Klindt describes accessing a file located on a web server and partly transferring processing from a web server to a user. More specifically, col. 6, lines 9-14 of Klindt describe “to implement reading information from the controller and displaying it in HTML pages, much of this information handling is done by the JAVA applets running on the browser of the host.” That is, Klindt describes a web page processing transfer from a server to a user by the use of JAVA applets. Thus, Klindt merely describes reading information locally by a transferring of processing by a controller from a server to a user, in contrast to sending ACM data from an ACM CPU to a web server and database module to embed ACM data in a file to facilitate transferring the ACM data to a network module in response to a request, as recited in Claim 11.

Accordingly, Claim 11 is submitted to be patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claims 13-16 and 18 depend from Claim 11. When the recitations of Claims 13-16 and 18 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 11, Applicants submit that Claims 13-16 and 18 likewise are patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claim 20 recites a method for managing and controlling an ACM system, the ACM system comprising, at least one network module located outside of a computer, the at least one network module electrically connected to a network and a web server and database module electrically connected to the at least one network module and located outside the at least one network module, said method comprising, “receiving by the at least one network module located outside of the computer a request for a file from the computer through the network; storing the file in a database of the web server and database module; and transmitting ACM data to be embedded in the file from an ACM CPU to facilitate

transferring the ACM data to the at least one network module in response to the request, wherein the ACM CPU is coupled directly to the web server and database module.”

No combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests a method for managing and controlling automation as recited in Claim 20. More specifically, no combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests a method that includes receiving a request for a file by at least one network module located outside of a computer, storing the file in a database of a web server and database module, and transmitting ACM data to be embedded in the file from an ACM CPU to facilitate transferring the ACM data to the at least one network module in response to the request. Rather, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Baker does not describe or suggest an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request and relies on Klindt as allegedly describing these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that “Klindt teaches the automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to the web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request.” In contrast to the Examiner’s allegation, Klindt does not describe or suggest embedding ACM data into a file located on a web server and database, rather, Klindt describes accessing a file located on a web server and partly transferring processing from a web server to a user. More specifically, col. 6, lines 9-14 of Klindt describe “to implement reading information from the controller and displaying it in HTML pages, much of this information handling is done by the JAVA applets running on the browser of the host.” That is, Klindt describes a web page processing transfer from a server to a user by the use of JAVA applets. Thus, Klindt merely describes reading information locally by a transferring of processing by a controller from a server to a user, in contrast to receiving a request for a file by at least one network module located outside of a computer, storing the file in a database of a web server and database module, and transmitting ACM data to be embedded in the file from an ACM CPU to facilitate transferring the ACM data to the at least one network module in response to the request, as recited in Claim 20.

Accordingly, Claim 20 is submitted to be patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claims 21-24 depend from Claim 20. When the recitations of Claims 21-24 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 20, Applicants submit that Claims 21-24 likewise are patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claim 25 recites a method for managing and controlling network traffic comprising utilizing at least one network module and a web server and database module located outside the at least one network module the method comprising, “receiving, by a first network module located outside of a computer, a message from the computer via a network; storing a file requested in the message in a database of the web server and database module; transferring the message from the first network module via an ACM backplane to the web server and database module to facilitate transferring the message to the first network module in response to a request, wherein the message is transferred from an ACM CPU that is coupled directly to the web server and database module.”

No combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests a method for managing and controlling network traffic as recited in Claim 25. More specifically, no combination of Baker and Klindt describes or suggests a method for managing and controlling network traffic that includes receiving a message by a first network module located outside of a computer, storing a file requested in the message in a database of a web server and database module, and transferring the message from the first network module via an ACM backplane to the web server and database module to facilitate transferring the message to the first network module in response to the request. Rather, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Baker does not describe or suggest an ACM CPU configured to send ACM data to a web server and database module, and to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request and relies on Klindt as allegedly describing these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that “Klindt teaches the automation control module (ACM) central processing unit (CPU) configured to send ACM data to the web server and database module to embed ACM data in the file to facilitate transferring ACM data to the network module in response to the request.” In contrast to the Examiner’s allegation, Klindt does not describe or suggest embedding ACM data into a file located on a web server and database, rather, Klindt describes accessing a file located on a web server and partly transferring processing from a web server to a user. More specifically, col. 6, lines 9-14 of Klindt describe “to implement reading information from the controller

and displaying it in HTML pages, much of this information handling is done by the JAVA applets running on the browser of the host.” That is, Klindt describes a web page processing transfer from a server to a user by the use of JAVA applets. Thus, Klindt merely describes reading information locally by a transferring of processing by a controller from a server to a user, in contrast to receiving a message by a first network module located outside of a computer, storing a file requested in the message in a database of a web server and database module, and transferring the message from the first network module via an ACM backplane to the web server and database module to facilitate transferring the message to the first network module in response to the request, as recited in Claim 25.

Accordingly, Claim 25 is submitted to be patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

Claims 26-30 depend from Claim 25. When the recitations of Claims 26-30 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 25, Applicants submit that Claims 26-30 likewise are patentable over Baker in view of Klindt.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-30 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin K. Jones/

Kevin K. Jones, Reg. No. 56,809
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, 26th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 621-5070